

REMARKS

In the November 4, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-29 were pending, but claims 1-15 had been "withdrawn" (actually canceled); objected to the specification and claim 25; rejected claim 24 under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112; and rejected claims 16-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patents 6,115,496 to Nguyen et al. and 4,803,477 to Miyatake et al. were cited. Claims 16-29 remain in the case. The Examiner's objections and rejections are traversed below.

Examiner Interview & Next Office Action

A telephonic Examiner Interview was held February 2, 2004 to discuss the citation of "Aleksic et al." in the last 2 paragraphs on page 4 of the Office Action in the rejection of claims 30-34. The Examiner acknowledged that there was no identification of "Aleksic et al." in the Office Action, but said that one of U.S. Patents 6,658,531 and 6,173,367 were being referenced. Since U.S. Patent 6,658,531 issued on December 2, 2003, after the Office Action was mailed, it is assumed that the intent was to cite U.S. Patent 6,173,367.

In addition, it was agreed to conduct another Examiner Interview after the Examiner has had an opportunity to review the claims and references again, but prior to issuing another Office Action, so that an explanation of how Miyatake et al. discloses the "predefined process having at least one parameter which determines a mapping of the mapping object" (claim 16, lines 3-4) can be provided.

Since the November 4, 2003 Office Action did not properly identify the references used in the rejection, if agreement cannot be reached as a result of the next Examiner Interview and any further amendment of the claims, it is submitted that the next Office Action should be non-final.

Objection to the Specification

In item 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure due to the use of reference numeral 105 both with and without the word "means" after "compression" in paragraph 0027. Paragraph 0027 has been amended to use consistent language. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection, or an explanation at the next Examiner Interview of what more is required is respectfully requested.

Objection to Claim 25

In item 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 25 due to the lack of a period at the end of the claim. Claim 25 has been amended to add a period. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

In item 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 24 was rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for failing to comply with the enablement requirement due to lack of support in the specification for the phrase "within a predefined tolerance". The Examiner's attention is directed to paragraph 16 on page 3 which uses this phrase. It is submitted that finding similarity between data of many types is known in the programming art and no more would be required for a programmer of ordinary skill to define a tolerance for correspondence between two parameters. If this is not sufficient support for the phrase, the Examiner is respectfully requested to explain at the next Examiner Interview what more would be required for one of ordinary skill in the art to find two parameters to correspond within a predefined tolerance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In item 5 on pages 2-5 of the Office Action, claims 16-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Nguyen et al. in view of Miyatake et al. In the first paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, it was acknowledged that "Nguyen et al. **does not disclose** determining an index by reference to ... at least one parameter" (Office Action, page 3, lines 7-9, emphasis in original), but it was asserted that "Miyatake et al. **discloses** ... a graphic data management system [which] carries out ... [a] search referring to, among other tables, [an] index table which includes a pointer which ... addresses ... graphic data in the memory" (Office Action, page 3, lines 10-12) in the Abstract and Summary of Miyatake et al.

Since what is taught by Miyatake et al. is described as "an index table which includes a pointer", it is unclear what in Miyatake et al. corresponds to a "predefined process having at least one parameter" (claim 16, lines 4-5). It is not understood how an index could be considered to be a predefined process. A fuller explanation at the next Examiner Interview of how Miyatake et al. teaches or suggests a "predefined process having at least one parameter which determines a mapping of the mapping object" is respectfully requested.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 16-29 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/3/04

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501